R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 021 143 VT 005 943

BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT OF THE DISADVANTAGED.
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, WASHINGTON, D.C.

PUB DATE APR 68

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 MC-$1.16 27P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SUBEMPLOYMENT, *EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS, *DISADVANTAGED GROUPS, WELFARE PROBLEMS, UNEMPLOYED, *SLUM ENVIRONMENT, DEPRESSED AREAS (GEOGRAPHIC), WORK ATTITUDES, *SOCIOECONOMIC INFLUENCES, INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS,

HALF A MILLION PERSONS, REPRESENTING 7.5 PERCENT OF THE POVERTY AREA WORK FORCE, WERE UNEMPLOYED IN THE POVERTY AREAS OF LARGE STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS IN MARCH 1966. HOWEVER, A REASONABLE, AND PROBABLY MINIMAL, ESTIMATE OF "SUBEMPLOYMENT" (A COMPOSITE MEASURE OF BOTH JOBLESSNESS AND EMPLOYMENT AT SUBSTANDARD WAGES) IN THESE POVERTY AREAS WOULD BE 1.5 MILLION. THE FACTORS WHICH PRODUCE SUBEMPLOYMENT IN BIG CITY POVERTY AREAS ARE AS DIVERSE AS THE CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PEOPLE AFFECTED. THEY ARE ALSO INTERRELATED, MUTUALLY REINFORCING, AND DIFFICULT TO DISENTANGLE. SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS, LACK OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING, ILL-HEALTH, DISCRIMINATION AND OTHER EMPLOYER PRACTICES WITH RESPECT TO SELECTION OF EMPLOYEES, AND DISTANCE FROM AVAILABLE JOBS ARE AMONG THE MANY BARRIERS WHICH CONTRIBUTE TO JOBLESSNESS, UNDEREMPLOYMENT, AND LOW EARNINGS. THE BARRIERS WHICH SEPARATE SUBEMPLOYED SLUM RESIDENTS FROM THE MAINSTREAM OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL LIFE HAVE RESULTED IN THE CREATION OF AN IRREGULAR ECONOMY IN POVERTY AREAS, A SEPARATE ECONOMIC WORLD WHICH DIFFERS VITALLY FROM THE MIDDLE-CLASS WORLD SURROUNDING THE SLUMS. THIS WORLD HAS ITS OWN SPECIAL VALUES, ITS OWN STRATEGIES FOR SURVIVAL, ITS OWN MORAL STANDARDS, AND ITS OWN CRITERIA OF SUCCESS OR FAILURE. MOTHERS RECEIVING ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE FEDERAL PROGRAM OF AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN ARE USED IN AN ILLUSTRATIVE STUDY OF ONE GROUP OF SUBEMPLOYED IN THE IRREGULAR ECONOMY. THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE VARIOUS DIMENSIONS OF SUBEMPLOYMENT FOR MANPOWER POLICIES ARE DISCUSSED. THIS CHAPTER APPEARS IN "MANPOWER REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT AND REPORT ON MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS, RESOURCES, UTILIZATION, AND TRAINING" (1968) AVAILABLE AS VT 001 025. (ET)

Manpower Message of the President and Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training. 1968.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED021143

3

BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT OF THE DISADVANTAGED

DO NOT REMOVE FROM THIS PAGE

5943

BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT OF THE DISADVANTAGED

The disadvantaged workers still jobless or underemployed in this period of economic prosperity—who, in the President's words, are ". . . blocked from productive employment by barriers rooted in poverty: lack of health, lack of education, lack of training, lack of motivation"[1]—are now the chief concern of manpower policy. If programs are to be shaped effectively to these workers' specific needs, deeper understanding of their problems and the obstacles to their employment is essential.

This chapter therefore explores the sociological, cultural, psychological, and economic barriers to employment of the disadvantaged in big city slums.[2] The introductory section sketches the major statistical dimensions of joblessness and underemployment in urban poverty areas. The chapter is concerned in the main, however, not with measurement and description of these problems but with exploration of their deep-rooted personal and environmental causes.

In this analysis, the barriers to employment are divided into those stemming from social-psychological characteristics and those access and institutional barriers which bar slum residents from otherwise available jobs. Since the special economic world that has developed in slum areas greatly influences the residents' attitudes toward regular jobs, this "irregular economy" is analyzed briefly. And there is an illustrative discussion of one important group of the poor and underemployed—the mothers receiving assistance under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. The emphasis in this discussion is on the complex interrelationships between employment and welfare for these women, and the possible implications of the findings for the new Work Incentive Program aimed at equipping more AFDC mothers for regular jobs.

In conclusion, some important objectives in job creation and other manpower policies that bear directly on the barriers to employment of the disadvantaged are reviewed. Suggestions are also made as to the strategies and program improvements that would strengthen present efforts to overcome these barriers and enable the hard-core unemployed and marginal workers to obtain and hold steady, decently paid jobs.

The Sub-Employed

The present measures of unemployment—limited, broadly, to persons who have no work at all and are actively seeking a job—are particularly inadequate for assessing the economic situation of disadvantaged workers in urban slums, and also rural areas. A broader, more useful concept for

[1] The President's message on Manpower, January 23, 1968, p. 2.

[2] For a discussion of the equally urgent problems of the rural poor, see the chapter on Geographic Factors in Employment and Manpower Development; also *The People Left Behind* (Washington: President's National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, September 1967).

analysis of the problems of these groups—that of sub-employment—was introduced in 1967 and developed further in the preceding chapter.

The concept of sub-employment broadens the traditional notions of attachment to the labor force and availability for work, and it introduces the issue of the quality of employment as represented by the level of wages. This is especially important for the development of manpower policy in poverty areas. The employed poor—with earnings below the poverty line even for full-time work—now represent a larger problem, at least in terms of numbers, than the unemployed. Yet they are a group which has so far received comparatively little attention.

Separate consideration of the different kinds of people included among the sub-employed is also essential. The sub-employed are a diverse group, with varied problems requiring different remedial approaches. No one policy will deal effectively with the employment problems of all the sub-employed, nor with all aspects of their problems.

Some of the sub-employed are unable to get or keep a job because of social-psychological characteristics or low motivation. But such difficulties must not be considered as characteristic of all the sub-employed. Nor can social-psychological barriers to employment be analyzed apart from the context of available opportunities.

Two obvious but crucial questions are: What are the reasons for the continuing high sub-employment among Negroes and other minority groups in large cities? What can be done to decrease it further? Efforts to answer these questions are seriously hampered by the inadequacy of present information. Some leads can be obtained, however, by pulling together the scattered and fragmentary evidence at hand. This section gives some highlights of the available data on the numbers and characteristics of the sub-employed in urban areas, as a background for considering the barriers to their employment.

UNEMPLOYMENT AND SUB-EMPLOYMENT IN POVERTY AREAS

While unemployment is only a partial index of the deprivation of slumdwellers, it is concentrated among the same groups that suffer from low earnings and other forms of sub-employment. The differences in unemployment rates between people in and outside poverty areas illustrate the gap in economic conditions between slum residents and the American people as a whole.

Half a million persons were unemployed in the poverty areas of large Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's) in March 1966, representing 7.5 percent of the poverty area work force. This unemployment rate was nearly double the national average rate at that time (4.0 percent).[3] One out of every 4 teenage workers (14 to 19 years old) in the poverty areas, and nearly 1 out of 10 nonwhites of all ages, were unemployed. Among nonwhite teenagers, nearly a third of the boys and nearly half of the girls were jobless. Furthermore, the geographic concentration of nonwhite unemployment was great; about 60 percent of the jobless nonwhites in the SMSA's were living in these poverty areas, four times the proportion for jobless white workers.

Startling as these figures are, they do not adequately represent the situation in some of the poorest city slums. The unemployment rate was 10 percent or more in the slum areas of 10 of the 13 cities for which information was obtained by the Department of Labor and cooperating State agencies in November 1966 (in three cities from independent studies).[4] In two of these city slums, the unemployment rate was above 15 percent.

Besides having high rates of unemployment, the workers in poverty areas were much more likely than others to be out of work for long periods (according to the March 1966 data). Above-average proportions of the men of normal working age were neither employed nor looking for work; many were unable to look for work because of poor health, and some had apparently been dis-

---

[3] The poverty area classification system used here was developed within the Bureau of the Census for the Office of Economic Opportunity. A total of 193 neighborhoods in 100 (of the 101) Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's), with a 1960 population of 250,000 or more were designated as "poverty areas" on the basis of an index of census tracts (reflecting 1960 income, education, skills, housing, and proportion of broken homes), contiguity of tracts, and the effects of urban renewal. The 193 poverty areas included about 22 percent of the census tracts in the SMSA's. For a detailed discussion of the poverty area definition, see Current Population Reports, Series P–23, No. 19, August 24, 1966; and *1960 Census of Population*, Supplementary Reports, PC(S1)–54, November 13, 1967.

For a full discussion of the poverty area findings of March 1966, see James R. Wetzel and Susan S. Holland, "Poverty Areas of Our Major Cities," *Monthly Labor Review*, October 1966, pp. 1105–1110, reprinted as Special Labor Force Report No. 75.

[4] For a discussion of these surveys and their findings, see *1967 Manpower Report*, pp. 74–75.

couraged by their inability to find a job. In addition, many slum residents had been able to find only part-time work, and the jobs they had were very often unskilled and low paying.

The evidence is thus overwhelming that any meaningful count of the disadvantaged—the sub-employed—in poverty areas of the country's large metropolitan centers would greatly exceed the half million found to be unemployed there in March 1966. A reasonable, and probably minimal, estimate of sub-employment (as defined in the preceding chapter) in these poverty areas would be 1.5 million.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SLUM RESIDENTS

The residents of poverty areas include above-average proportions of older people; of widowed, divorced, and separated persons; of households headed by women; and of members of ethnic minority groups.

Nevertheless, white people outnumber nonwhites by 3 to 2 in urban poverty areas as a whole, according to the March 1966 survey. It is only in the very worst slums that nonwhites predominate in total numbers.[5] Because of their extremely high rate of unemployment, however, nonwhites represent a majority of all the poverty area unemployed.

Is poverty area unemployment primarily a youth problem, a conclusion reached by many observers? As shown by the figures already cited, the proportion of poverty area youth unemployed—and presumably alienated in many cases—is shockingly high. On the other hand, many men in the prime working ages are also jobless in these areas. And since there are not nearly as many teenagers as adult men, unemployed youth constitute a relatively small proportion of all unemployed males in poverty areas, as in the country generally.

A recent study in Newark, N.J., confirms the finding that youth unemployment is not the numerically dominant type in poverty areas. The unemployment rate for Negro males 16 to 19 years of age in these slum areas was 33 percent, and for those aged 20 to 24 it was 13 percent. The group aged 25 and over had a lower unemployment rate (8 percent) but represented 60 percent of all unemployed Negro men.[6] Clearly, manpower policy must be as much concerned with the employment needs of adult men in the ghettos as with those of jobless youth.

Public policy must also recognize the variations in social characteristics among slum residents. While detailed data on the sub-employed are not available, information on the general characteristics of the poverty area population strongly suggests the extent of variability. Accounts of social pathology in the slums frequently tend to obscure these important differences.

Although the proportion of families headed by women is higher in poverty areas than elsewhere, nearly two-thirds of the families in such areas in 1966 were headed by men. Contrary to a widely held notion, the proportion of large families was no higher there than in the country generally; the proportion of families with six or more members was about 15 percent in each case. Furthermore, although relatively more of the employed workers in poverty areas than of the country's work force as a whole were in service and laboring jobs, the proportion in such jobs was only 1 out of 3; the number in somewhat higher level occupations was twice as large.

There is, thus, some strength and stability in poverty areas, as well as considerable social pathology and disorganization. Neither the positive nor the negative aspects of the situation should be overlooked in policy development.

The variations from one ghetto area to another can also be considerable. A study of unemployed, out-of-school Negro youth in the Harlem and the Bedford-Stuyvesant areas of New York City, for example, showed sizable differences in outlook. Asked whether they expected to have the income they would need to support a family with two children within the next 5 to 10 years, 44 percent of Harlem youth, as contrasted with only 28 percent of those in Bedford-Stuyvesant, showed high expectations. The expectations of the youth in Harlem approached, though they did not quite equal, those of middle-class high school students.[7]

Relatively more of the Harlem than of the

[5] *1967 Manpower Report*, p. 76.

[6] Jack Chernick, Bernard P. Indik, and George Sternlieb, *Newark-New Jersey: Population and Labor Force, Spring 1967* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers—The State University, December 1967), p. 12.

[7] *Study of the Meaning, Experience, and Effects of the Neighborhood Youth Corps on Negro Youth Who are Seeking Work*, pt. I (New York: New York University, Center for the Study of Unemployed Youth, January 1967), pp. XIII and XIV, and pp. 149–150.

93-459 O - 68 - 8

Bedford-Stuyvesant youth had been born in New York City or had come from the urban—instead of the rural—South. Consequently, the Harlem young people tended to be in better economic circumstances, as shown by their job histories and their families' earnings situation.

Probably the most important generalization that can be made about ghettos and poverty areas is their heterogeneity. No single program can reach all groups of slumdwellers.

Barriers to Employment

The factors which produce sub-employment in big city poverty areas are as diverse as the characteristics of the people affected. They are also interrelated, mutually reinforcing, and difficult to disentangle. Social-psychological factors, lack of education and training, ill health, discrimination, and other employer practices with respect to selection of employees, and distance from available jobs are among the many barriers which contribute to joblessness, underemployment, and low earnings.

The following sections discuss three kinds of barriers to employment of the disadvantaged—social-psychological, access, and institutional.[8]

SOCIAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL BARRIERS

One interpretation of the high rates of joblessness and low earnings in city slums, increasingly cited as the general level of unemployment drops, stresses the presumed distinctive characteristics of the big city sub-employed—that they are less motivated to work, lack perseverance in working, and are generally alienated from the world of work. Although not fully supported, this explanation does have some validity. Reports by employers about men from poverty areas who were placed on jobs and then quit them seem to indicate that the work attitudes and motivation of the sub-employed of big cities are major barriers to their regular employment. Just how important these social-psychological factors are in the total complex of factors affecting the employment of disadvantaged workers is not certain, however. And the strategies that would be most effective in dealing with such factors are neither obvious nor free from controversy.

The social-psychological factors encompassed in explanations of the job behavior of low-income Negroes and others who have difficulty in getting and keeping jobs include attitudes, aspirations, motivation (especially achievement motivation), ability or willingness to defer gratification, and self-image. Most frequently, the individual's early family experiences are used to explain the development of this complex of attitudes and motivations. The basic assumption is that a person's perception of himself, his attitudes towards work, his motivation, and his ability to postpone gratifications affect his chances of getting and keeping a job.

The important considerations from the perspective of this analysis are the distribution, relevance, and causality of the various possible factors. Distribution denotes the extent to which a given factor or attribute, considered an important element in a positive orientation toward work, is found among the fully employed and not among the sub-employed. Relevance refers to the relationship between the particular factor and work-connected behavior—that is, how important the factor really is in work behavior. Causality concerns the genesis of the attribute: Is it a reaction to a particular set of job-related events, or does it have more deep-seated roots?

Distribution

Assuming that a complex of attitudes, aspirations, motivations, and identity orientation affects work behavior, does this lead, among the sub-employed, to crippling or otherwise inadequate outlooks toward work? Few studies on this general subject present data pertaining to the sub-employed as such; much more commonly they contrast Negroes with whites, or persons of

[8] For a more extended review of the social science literature in which this classification is developed, see Martin Rein, "Social Science and the Elimination of Poverty," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, May 1967, pp. 146–163.

lower socioeconomic status (as measured by income, occupation, education, or some combination of the three) with those of higher position. Before examining some findings of these studies, however, it is essential to note that neither the poor, nor the nonpoor, nor Negroes, nor whites are homogenous. Furthermore, there is overlap in characteristics among groups. Some poor rank higher in social-psychological characteristics, no matter what the indicator, than some nonpoor. Consequently, public policy must be flexible and allow a variety of approaches if the sub-employed are to be aided effectively.

Although many studies show that relatively more people of high than of low socioeconomic status have positive work attitudes, this is far from a uniform finding. For example, a study of Job Corps enrollees concluded that the aspirations of the youth participating in this program did not differ substantially from those of youth in better circumstances.[9]

The aspiration data are complex. There is evidence, for example, that Negro parents often have very high educational aspirations for their children. These aspirations may be unrealistically high, as is often charged. But this is very different from the contention, also frequently made, that it is low aspirations which produce poor results in getting and keeping a job.

It has been suggested that the need to achieve is relatively low among persons at the poverty level, partly because early training in self-reliance may be less prevalent in poor families than in those in higher socioeconomic groups. Furthermore, several studies indicate that low-status Negroes have less need for achievement than low-status whites.[10] But there is conflicting evidence as well. For example, one sample of low-income Negro residents of a public housing project revealed that more than two-thirds agreed with the statement that "the most important qualities of a real man are determination and driving ambition." [11]

Aspiration is also relative to the expectation that one can achieve what one aspires to. This is shown by a study of Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees (referred to previously). Only one-third of the unemployed Negro youth thought their chances of having enough income to support a family within 5 to 10 years were very good. When male freshmen and sophomores at a Catholic and a Negro university were asked the same question, the proportion reporting such expectations was twice as large (approximately 2 out of every 3). And more than one-half of a sample of Catholic high school students responded that their chances of being able to support a family within the indicated period were "very good." [12]

The findings of studies on deferred and delayed gratification also warrant careful attention. A number of studies investigating the ability to postpone gratification in order to gain a larger reward in the future have failed to indicate any uniform or striking differences between respondents in lower socioeconomic groups and those in higher positions.[13]

Relevance

Social-psychological variables do not always have a clear-cut relationship to work behavior. The need to achieve has been offered as an important causal explanation of work behavior—workers who have a low need to achieve perform less satisfactorily. But in one study of unemployed males, a significant relationship between achievement motivation and job-finding success was not established. When Negroes and young workers (21 years old and under) were eliminated from the analysis, a stronger relationship was evident. Nevertheless, these findings suggest that, for certain groups at least, there is question about the importance of the need-achievement variable.[14]

Studies on a national scale also raise questions about the importance of achievement motivation. A comparative analysis of social mobility, for example, indicates that workers in France, the Netherlands, and Germany, characterized as hav-

---

[9] Sar A. Levitan, "Job Corps," *Examination of the War on Poverty* (Washington: 90th Cong., 1st sess., U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, August 1967), Staff and Consultants Reports, vol. 1, p. 26.

[10] Thomas F. Pettigrew, "Negro American Personality: Why Isn't More Known?" *Journal of Social Issues*, April 1964, p. 13.

[11] William Yancy, "Some Adaptations to Underemployment," paper prepared for the Southern Sociological Meeting in Atlanta, Ga., April 11–13, 1968.

[12] *Study of the Meaning, Experience, and Effects of the Neighborhood Youth Corps on Negro Youth Who are Seeking Work*, pp. 149–150.

[13] S. M. Miller, Frank Riessman, and Arthur A. Seagull, "Poverty and Self-Indulgence: A Critique of the Non-Deferred Gratification Pattern," in *Poverty in America*, eds. Louis A. Ferman, Joyce L. Kornbluh, and Alan Haber (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1965), pp. 285–302.

[14] Harold L. Sheppard and A. Harvey Belitsky, *The Job Hunt: Jobseeking Behavior of Unemployed Workers in a Local Economy* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1966), pp. 114 ff.

ing relatively low need-achievement,[15] do not differ markedly in mobility from workers in the United States and Britain, where need-achievement levels are higher.

Obviously, attitudes and values tend to intermingle with situational factors of opportunity and chance.

Causality

Attitudes and motivations can lead people to shun particular kinds of jobs or to handle them poorly. This is beyond question. But the chain of causality may move in the other direction also—unsatisfactory job experiences may lead to negative attitudes and motivations. Difficulty in getting a job, irregularity of employment, and inadequacy of wages may all contribute to low aspirations and expectations and inability to persevere on a job. Thus, ". . . the Negro youth starts out with determination to do a good job, but experience with a number of menial, low-paying, and insecure jobs quickly produces an erosion of his commitment to work" [16]

Moreover, failure to develop a work identity may lead to the development of an identity which competes with employment. The youth who lacks a work identity, as well as an identity as a husband and father, "must seek in other ways to construct a self which provides some measure of gratification of needs and earns some measure of recognition of one's self as a social being." The development of a "dramatic self" through adherence to the "expressive life style" provides an alternative identity.[17] If the youth is successful in establishing such an identity, it will provide him with the security, social participation, and feeling of status that he has failed to achieve through the worker-provider role. In dropping out of family life, he drops into a male-centered social world that provides a "strategy for survival," even though not centered about work.

Both early life experiences and those as a worker can contribute to the development of a life style which competes with an effective work identity. But once again, the chain of causality is not clear. The attitudes engendered by the family in early life can be reinforced, overturned, or modified as a result of later experiences.

In some respects, the behavior of the poor is less a reflection of basic values than an effort to cope with current situations. The mechanisms used for this purpose (such as dropping out of regular work and engaging instead in illicit activities) may have many negative consequences. But more important from the viewpoint of social policy is the question of whether these adjustive reactions, or "survival techniques," are responses to particular experiences and situations or the result of basic values learned at an early age and little affected by outside influences thereafter. Obviously, if later experiences, rather than early family life, have the more potent influence on work attitudes, changing these experiences may be a most important route to influencing workers' development.

This brief examination of a large and complicated body of literature suggests the following tentative conclusions:

—Since the disadvantaged are not homogeneous, what may be characteristic of the most troubled individuals in this category may not be generally applicable to the disadvantaged.

—The dividing line between employability and the lack of it is not fixed. In part, it reflects employers' judgments about individuals, made in the context of the general labor supply-and-demand situation. These relative judgments apply to the work attitudes and motivation of individuals as well as their levels of education and skill.

—The extent to which these difficulties are the major factors in sub-employment is unclear. Still lacking is an adequate understanding of the connections between attitudes and work patterns. Attitudes are certainly significant, but it is not yet possible to say what the most relevant attitudes are, nor precisely how they influence actions.

---

[15] David C. McClelland, *The Achieving Society* (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1961), pp. 90 ff.; and Thomas Fox and S. M. Miller, "Intra-Country Variations: Occupational Stratification and Mobility," and Seymour Martin Lipset and Hans L. Detterberg, "A Theory of Social Mobility" in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset, *Class, Status, and Power* (revised ed.; New York: The Free Press, 1967).

[16] *Study of the Meaning, Experience, and Effects of the Neighborhood Youth Corps on Negro Youth Who are Seeking Work*, p. 182.

[17] Lee Rainwater, "Work and Identity in the Lower Class," in *Planning for a Nation of Cities*, ed. Sam Bass Warner, Jr. (Cambridge, Mass.: The M.I.T. Press, 1966), pp. 105–123, and "The Lessons of Pruitt-Igoe," *The Public Interest*, Summer 1967, pp. 116–126.

The policy implications of the social-psychological factors are uncertain also. Two possible approaches are suggested. One emphasizes the necessity of direct efforts to modify the attitudes of the disadvantaged before introducing them to job situations. The other would bring the sub-employed into the job situation and then add the activities and services that may be needed to influence their attitudes and their ability to handle the demands of work.

The first approach is based on the principle of preparation—preparing people in advance for a change in environment. The latter approach seeks to provide supports for them after they have entered a different environment. The shift from preparation to support is an important change in the conception of the role of social services.

In the early 1960's, the emphasis was largely upon the first approach—through programs which aimed at motivating workers, especially the young, and which stressed prevocational activities and training in attitudes and social skills. More recently, however, emphasis has shifted to getting workers into jobs—based on the theory that "real-life" work situations are those most likely to affect attitudes. The aim is to provide a setting in which a disadvantaged individual can perform adequately without a fully developed work identity and can then move in the direction of strengthening that identity. In some programs, traditional guidance and casework have been superseded by the development of racial pride and identity as a method of improving the capacity to take and hold a job.[18]

This approach also implies the necessity for selective job development aimed at the particular groups to be served—which is one of the major new emphases in manpower programs. The cooperation of private industry is being sought in efforts to employ the disadvantaged in regular jobs. But protected job situations may be needed for a relatively small residual group (as further discussed later in this chapter).

Since low-income "families differ in background, in resources and skills, and in their ability to cope with the vicissitudes of a marginal existence," [19] no one program will succeed with all. Nor should it be assumed that the same social-psychological factors are equally significant in every case.

ACCESS AND INSTITUTIONAL BARRIERS

The obstacles that stand between disadvantaged workers and jobs are partly personal, partly environmental and institutional. To consider the personal factors first, a great many ghetto residents—including Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans as well as Negroes—do not have the basic education and command of standard English generally required for employment. Many more lack the work skills essential for the available jobs. Health problems and lack of adequate medical care are also pervasive difficulties. Police and bad debt records are further barriers to employment for significant numbers.

Besides these personal factors (discussed in last year's *Manpower Report*),[20] many sub-employed have an added difficulty: they do not look like "typical" employed workers. Differences in dress, hairstyle, and grooming make them less likely to be employed. "The style is the man" is an old saying which has some force, but its aptness may be overemphasized in judging fitness for work.

Undoubtedly, some sub-employed mirror in their personal appearance and behavior the kinds of difficulties they might have on the job—untidiness, inattention to detail, unreliability. For some, the usual employment situation may not be appropriate. But employers should realize that an unsatisfactory personal appearance is not indicative in all cases of inability to handle the usual work situation. An inadequate awareness of what jobs demand in terms of personal bearing may be involved. This lack of awareness can be overcome in many cases when the individuals' difficulties do not have deep psychological roots. In some cases, graded work experiences can help individuals adapt over time to job demands. The "strangeness" of some sub-employed should certainly not be regarded as typical of all of them. Nor should even those whose appearance is most disturbing to employers be rejected without exploration of their ability to adapt to work situations, given special help.

An additional obstacle to employment is the

[18] See, for example, the discussion of the Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC) Program and Project PRIDE in the chapter on New Developments in Manpower Programs.

[19] Helen Icken Safa, *An Analysis of Upward Mobility in Low Income Families; A Comparison of Family and Community Life Among American Negro and Puerto Rican Poor* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, Youth Development Center, 1967), p. 100.

[20] See *1967 Manpower Report*, p. 78 ff. In addition, the relation of lack of education to the problems of ethnic minority groups is discussed in the section on Equality of Opportunity in the preceding chapter of the present report.

lack of adequate child-care facilities. This affects a significant number of women who want and need work (as discussed in the section on The AFDC Mother later in this chapter, and also in the *1967 Manpower Report*).[21]

The barriers discussed in this section are those relating to the job search, travel to jobs, institutional factors affecting hiring and promotion, and the current job structure.

The Job Search

Many disadvantaged persons, willing to work and looking for jobs, do not know how to go about the job search effectively. The slum resident is, to a large extent, confined to his own neighborhood. And jobs in outlying areas, or even in the central city of which the neighborhood is a part, are likely to be beyond his reach. Inadequate transportation, changes in occupational patterns, or shifts of industry from central cities to surrounding suburbs inhibit his search.

The disadvantaged youth or adult, then, starts on an active job hunt beset by problems. For the most part, the job does not come to him, although some efforts at recruiting within areas of concentrated poverty have been made in the last few years. The slum resident must search out available openings, and he may do this in a number of ways—through the nearest placement services; through newspaper ads; through direct application to plants, stores, or other possible locations of job openings; or through friends or relatives.

Learning about available jobs from friends and relatives is central to the job search, both in and outside poverty areas. But in the slums, this source of information is restricted by the limited connections which exist with the outside job world and also within the community. What little job information slum residents can get from friends and relatives usually pertains only to low-level occupations.

For people in poverty areas, social segregation and personal isolation act as barriers. Negro residential segregation has been increasing steadily over the past decade in cities throughout the United States, despite overall improvements in the socioeconomic status of Negroes.[22] This segregation has the effect of confining networks of informal communication to within the ethnic communities. Yet the lower the socioeconomic status of the community, the weaker the intracommunity network is likely to be, except where kin-group association is strong. Furthermore, unemployment contributes to social isolation; this is indicated by research conducted during the depression of the 1930's, as well as by more recent studies.[23]

Thus, in lower income communities, the long-term unemployed person often suffers the double burden of relative isolation within his own community, as well as segregation from the larger world of the metropolis. In some situations, such as that of the Pruitt-Igoe public housing project in St. Louis, most forms of interpersonal relationships are regarded with mistrust.[24]

The frequency with which informal information is relied upon in looking for jobs is made clear by a number of studies. A survey of workers affected by plant shutdowns in five communities revealed that from 31 to 53 percent of those who had been successful in finding new jobs had relied on informal information. In a sample of young labor force entrants, as many as 60 percent reported reliance upon friends or relatives.[25] Workers covered by these studies made relatively little use of the State Employment Service.

A nationwide survey of the 1962 graduates of vocational high schools showed the Negro youth to be more dependent than the whites upon informal sources of assistance in their job search. Half of all Negro students, as contrasted with about one-third of the white students, depended upon friends or relatives to assist them in finding jobs. The Negroes received less help from the schools' job placement facilities than the white students. Though they relied more than whites on the State Employment Service, the importance of this service to them as a source of job referrals

---

[21] See *1967 Manpower Report*, p. 81.

[22] Karl E. and Alma F. Taeuber, "The Negro as an Immigrant Group," *American Journal of Sociology*, January 1964, p. 378. For their nationwide study, see *Negroes in Cities* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1965).

[23] See Edward Wright Bakke, *Citizens Without Work* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1940), p. 7; Mirra Komarovsky, *The Unemployed Man and His Family* (Morningside Heights, N.Y.: Institute of Social Research, 1940), p. 128; H. W. Singer, *Unemployment and the Unemployed* (London: P. S. King & Son, Ltd., 1940), p. 100; and H. Pope, "Economic Deprivation and Social Participation," *Social Problems*, Winter 1964, p. 291.

[24] Lee Rainwater, "Fear and the House-as-Haven in the Lower Class," in *Urban Renewal; People, Politics, and Planning*, ed. Jewell Bellush and Murray Hausknecht (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1967).

[25] Richard C. Wilcock and Walter H. Franke, *Unwanted Workers* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963), and Larry D. Singell, "Some Private and Social Aspects of the Labor Mobility of Young Workers," *Quarterly Review of Economics and Business*, Spring 1966, p. 21.

was limited, compared with their dependence on friends and relatives.[26]

Since dependence upon these informal sources of job information is so widespread, the accelerated movement of Negroes into technical and professional work, and into other white-collar and skilled manual jobs, should open up a new source of job information. The individuals entering such jobs should be channels of information to sub-employed friends and family members, not only about the job market in general but also about specific job openings.

The problem of bringing sub-employed slum residents within reach of information which would contribute to job-finding success is much larger than this, however. One approach to dissolving the communications barrier in the segregated ghetto lies in aiding the sub-employed to move to other neighborhoods. There are compelling reasons for this approach. But even if open housing policies come rapidly closer to meeting their objectives in this direction, people who move may continue to lack needed job information. Individuals and families whose social status or racial characteristics differ greatly from the majority in their neighborhood tend to remain isolated. Consequently, the need for increased efforts to get adequate job information to disadvantaged members of minority groups may extend to those in open housing.

Another approach is to improve the lines of communication to slum residents. One technique for doing this is to use workers from the poverty area to provide job information through personal contacts. In addition, community meeting places, such as churches and pool halls, may be used as information centers. Formal lines of communication can also be established through radio and television, which are more likely to reach lower income people than are newspapers and other written materials. And when placement services are brought into the slum areas, as has been done in the recent past, considerable improvement in job placements has occurred. The effectiveness of these techniques is limited, however, by the number of suitable jobs available, and the lack of inexpensive transportation to outlying areas may be a major obstacle.

A third approach is to bring jobs into ghetto areas. The visibility of new plants or business offices heightens the community's knowledge of available opportunities. In addition, it facilitates direct application to the company itself. The recent opening of a new tent factory in the Watts district of Los Angeles, for example, has demonstrated how effective this approach can be in informing workers about opportunities, even though only 300 of the 5,500 applicants for jobs at the plant could be hired.[27] Information about job availability must not, of course, be equated with employment, especially when jobs are in limited supply.

Transportation

Metropolitan areas, of which slums and poverty areas are a part, are generally regarded as integrated job markets. But this generalization obscures the problems of specialized job markets and of the relationship between the location of a worker's home and the likelihood that he will be unemployed.

The isolation of slum residents, both youth and adults, from the larger urban area inhibits their participation in the broader job market, thus contributing to the problem of sub-employment. But there is another link between unemployment and slum residence, through the existence of a local and specialized juvenile job market, which warrants special attention. The situation has been described as follows:

> The teenage children of poor families desperately need after-school jobs; this work may . . . be a prerequisite to their remaining in school. But the demand for their services, for such things as baby-sitting, grass-cutting, snow-shoveling, lies largely in the middle- and upper-income neighborhoods . . . in the large urban area the supply of young labor may be many miles removed from the demand for it. In short, we . . . do not have an effective market for juvenile labor. . . . Slum children without part-time work may drop out of school, virtually ensuring a lifetime of low-grade employment at best and perhaps chronic unemployment.[28]

The lack of connections between young people who need part-time jobs and their potential employers is among the hidden social costs of the slum. It is one which the in-school program of the Neighborhood Youth Corps is specifically designed to offset—by generating within the ghetto opportunities for part-time employment of school youth. The alternative approach would be to bridge the

[26] Max V. Enlger, *The Process and Product of T & I High School Level Vocational Education in the United States* (Pittsburgh: American Institutes for Research, September 1965), ch. 5, p. 41.

[27] *New York Times*, December 24, 1967, sec. A, p. 34.

[28] Wilbur R. Thompson, *A Preface to Urban Economics* (Washington: Resources for the Future, Inc., 1965), p. 373.

gap between residence and place of employment through transportation strategies.

A similar gap separates adults in the slums from the areas of growing employment opportunity in their city's outskirts. Business and jobs are increasingly moving to the suburbs.[29] While the suburbanite commutes to the city for his work, residents of central city slums seldom commute to jobs in the new and expanding plants in the outer suburban ring.

Here again, three solutions to the problem are possible—to bring jobs to the slums, to help slum residents move to the suburbs, or to accept a spatial separation between work and residence for many of these people and link the two by transportation. Each of the three solutions has both advantages and disadvantages. Bringing jobs to the ghetto will reinforce and solidify its elements of strength. Bringing slum residents to suburbia will weaken the ghetto and, if accompanied by open housing policies, will promote economic and racial integration. Arranging for people to commute to jobs from present slum areas will require coordination of job development and transportation programs, if sub-employment problems are not to be reduced at the cost of intensifying urban traffic crises.

As barriers to employment are identified and efforts are made to reduce them, it must not be assumed that each step in this direction will by itself lead to increased employment and higher income. For example, improvements in transportation aimed at enlarging employment opportunities for residents of poverty areas may not be effective in every case. Multiple strategies, rather than dependence upon a single one, will be necessary.

Institutional Barriers

Among the institutional factors which impede employment of slum residents—most of whom are members of ethnic minority groups and many of whom are old—discrimination is probably the most important. Discrimination not only in hiring but in access to promotion ladders dominates the life of many of the sub-employed (as discussed earlier in this report).[30]

The recruiting and hiring of workers is a selection process—although some critics have asserted that it is basically an exclusion process, which keeps out workers who do not fit personnel officers' conception of the model employee their company should have. Job applicants undergo a process of testing, interviewing, and credential scrutiny which operates to bar many of the sub-employed who might perform usefully on jobs.

Two types of errors are possible in the selection process—first, the rejection of persons who could handle satisfactorily the job to be filled and, second, the hiring of persons unable to perform the tasks involved at a satisfactory level. Much current hiring practice is concerned with preventing the second kind of error—a logical emphasis where the focus of concern is on the firm and its profits. But from a broader economic and social viewpoint, the first kind of error has become increasingly important, since it is one of the factors restricting job opportunities for the sub-employed.

The requirement of a high school diploma for many relatively low-skilled jobs is a particular obstacle to employment of disadvantaged workers—including large numbers of youth who are school dropouts. Employers argue that, in selecting employees, they must consider their potentiality for advancement to positions where the work demands a high school education, even if this is not necessary for the tasks involved in the entry jobs. But in view of the great need for enlarged opportunities for workers with limited education, this hiring policy should be reconsidered wherever possible.

The contention that a high school diploma has little relevance for many jobs is supported by several strands of evidence. For example, in a number of Western European countries—including France, Switzerland, Sweden, West Germany, and the Netherlands—workers from Southern Europe and Africa have done much useful factory work. Many of these foreign workers not only had less education than the sub-employed of the United States but could not speak the local language.

In this country, according to a recent study, few firms have ever systematically evaluated the performance of employees with different levels of education. Some data are available, however, on employees in private industry and government agencies, which compare the performance of workers at the same occupational level but with

[29] For discussion of this trend in the location of employment and the problems it creates for central city residents, see the chapter on Geographic Factors in Employment and Manpower Development.

[30] See section on Equality of Opportunity in the preceding chapter.

different amounts of education.[31] The indicators of performance used were of several types: Occasionally a direct productivity measure was utilized, but more often an indirect indicator such as absenteeism, employee turnover, or the rate of promotion was used. As might be expected, the results demonstrate that education is no guarantee of good performance. But more significantly, the opposite is suggested by some data. Thus, in many specific occupations, in a variety of industries and firms, the lower educated may do as well as, and often better than, workers with more formal training.

This information is by no means as definitive and comprehensive as would be desirable, since the occupations were not systematically sampled. But the clear implication is that the prevalent, mechanical requirement of a high school diploma or other certificate of education eligibility for a wide range of jobs may result in barring potentially useful workers.[32]

Many employers also use various kinds of paper-and-pencil tests to screen prospective employees. The use of objective tests in lieu of subjective judgment has the potential to work in favor of members of minority groups. However, all too often these tests are used without any evidence that they are related to performance on the job, and the same standard of test performance is applied to applicants for jobs of differing levels of skill within the same plant. The use of tests under these circumstances may result in excluding workers with low levels of education or limited command of English from jobs they could handle. Extensive efforts have been made, however, by the Department of Labor and other organizations to develop intelligence and aptitude tests which are free of cultural bias. It is important that these should continue, and also that great care should be used in the selection, administration, and interpretation of tests, in order to prevent unwarranted rejection of disadvantaged workers, especially those from ethnic minority groups.

The Job Structure

So far, the discussion has been restricted to the barriers limiting opportunities for the sub-employed in existing jobs. But another question may be posed: Should the existing structure of jobs be regarded as given, or is it possible and desirable to change the context of some jobs so as to open more opportunities for the sub-employed?

The present division of tasks and responsibilities among occupations reflects both deliberate, rational allocation of tasks and more haphazard factors. The structure of jobs and occupations has been much influenced by tradition, interest groups, and accident, as well as by careful analysis of who could best perform a particular task and under what conditions.

No single pattern of division of labor by any means represents the only way the tasks could be divided. During World War II, for example, a considerable amount of job dilution occurred; people with less training than was formerly required did a great deal of essential work. And in more recent years, the distribution of tasks in the medical field has been shifting towards service workers (e.g., nurse aides) from middle-level professionals (e.g., nurses), who in turn have taken over some tasks from top professionals (physicians).

Many job openings in professional, technical, and skilled occupations are unfilled because of a lack of trained manpower. This may be due in part to demographic influences (i.e., the low birthrates of the 1930's), but it also reflects hiring requirements. Each occupation seeks the "best" people, although by definition the "best" can be only a few. Yet this general search for the best could build a permanent insufficiency of manpower able to meet hiring specifications.

The scarcity of qualified workers for many present jobs suggests that it may be desirable to reallocate tasks so that the best are not always necessary, and to recognize the likelihood that workers judged less than the best can do useful work. The development of more subprofessional jobs in health and related fields is a trend in this direction, but comparable developments have not occurred on a wide scale in other types of employment.

Opportunities for the sub-employed would be increased immediately by the opening of more unskilled jobs. But the number of unskilled jobs has not been growing, and there is little if any evidence of a "filtering down" to make jobs formerly the preserve of the more skilled workers available to the less skilled. Progress in this direction has been

[31] A preliminary report on the findings of this study appears in Ivar Berg, "Educational Requirements for Jobs," *Manpower Strategies for the Metropolis*, ed. Eli Ginzberg (New York: Columbia University Press, in press).

[32] S. M. Miller, *Breaking the Credentials Barrier* (New York: The Ford Foundation, 1968).

impeded partly by the frequent mingling of unskilled and skilled tasks in jobs labeled as skilled. But it also reflects employers' reluctance to take on a new kind of labor, unable to meet their traditional hiring requirements; they may prefer to have some unfilled job openings, rather than face the problems such a change would entail.

Altogether, the present job structure and placement processes bar many of the sub-employed from jobs—particularly from jobs which have some status and are relatively well paid. The job structure also retards the upgrading of workers whose previous positions could then be filled by the sub-employed, and it restricts the downgrading of jobs in order to open them to the sub-employed. The problems the sub-employed face in their job search are obviously created in major part by this rigid job structure. Strategies for aiding their entry into steady employment will have to be concerned, among other things, with provision of incentives for modifying jobs so that disadvantaged workers can qualify for them.

The Irregular Economy of Poverty Areas

The barriers which separate sub-employed slum residents, nonwhite or white, from the mainstream of economic and social life have resulted in the creation of a separate economic world, which differs vitally, and in many ways, from the middle-class world surrounding the slums. This world has its own special values, its own strategies for survival, its own moral standards, its own criteria of success or failure.

The sources of income of the poor and dependent—those at the bottom one-fifth of the income distribution—are varied, and public policy is directed at altering them in many ways. When income from employment is low, unstable, and unpredictable, the traditional distinctions between employment and unemployment, work and welfare become blurred, and extra-legal sources of income may be sought.

The contrasts between this irregular economy [33] of the slums and the country's regular economy are sharp. In the regular economy, work offers opportunities for vertical mobility, a reasonably predictable pattern of wage improvement with increasing seniority and skill, and the possibility of stable employment. Jobs can be classified in terms of status, skill requirements, and level and stability of earnings—as white- or blue-collar, skilled or unskilled, salaried or paying an hourly wage. By contrast, the irregular economy is characterized by horizontal mobility, erratic wage fluctuations, and overlap between the welfare and the wage systems. Jobs are better described as dead end, low wage, sporadic, extra-legal, and so forth.

The size, characteristics, and fluctuations of the irregular economy are not well known nor understood. How does this economy work? How does it overlap with the regular economy? What are its implications for public policy?

The irregular economy has many different income streams, which blend into economic sustenance for slumdwellers. Many people work in low-wage, part-time, marginal jobs that provide no ladder to better opportunities. The work may be physically exacting, job security low, and employment offered only on a short-time basis. In some jobs, the employer pays so little that employees have great temptation to steal from him in order to supplement their earnings. Occasionally, a criminal activity may be the source of income, but the situation is seldom so clear cut. A man may have his own type of "hustle"—an easy way to money, sometimes legitimate, sometimes partly not, that puts him in a quasi-entrepreneurial role. For example, he may discover where he can get a watch cheap—a "hot" watch—and then sell it to someone on his block. A woman may be on welfare for some months of the year and work in other months; [34] or she may receive welfare and at the same time work covertly; or a man may be living with a woman receiving welfare. As another alternative, a man may enroll in one of the training programs which pay stipends, in order to get funds to tide him over a lean period. Or he may borrow money, to be repaid when he gets a job or a hustle. Or he may decide to retire temporarily from the "scuffle" for a livelihood, and

[33] The irregular economy is discussed by Louis A Ferman in an unpublished paper titled, "The Irregular Economy: Informal Work Patterns in the Urban Ghetto" (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan—Wayne State University, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, June 1967).

[34] In 1966 about 12 percent of the case closings on AFDC were attributable to employment or increased earnings of the mothers.

so swell the ranks of the jobless. However, many ghetto residents show high motivation and unusual resourcefulness and persistence in efforts to earn a living.

A possible basis of life for marginal workers is thus provided by the irregular economy. The variations of this world, its occasional excitement and flexibility, may have more appeal to many such workers than do low-paid, demanding, regular jobs. According to a recent study:

> . . . the streetcorner man . . . knows the social value of the job by the amount of money the employer is willing to pay him for doing it. . . . every pay day, he counts . . . the value placed on the job by society at large. . . . Nor does the low-wage job offer prestige, respect, interesting work, opportunity for learning or advancement, or any other compensation . . . [The low-wage job in the regular economy is] hard, dirty, uninteresting and underpaid. The rest of society . . . holds the job of the dishwasher or janitor or unskilled laborer in low esteem if not outright contempt. So does the streetcorner man. He cannot do otherwise. He cannot draw from a job those social values which other people do not put into it.[35]

The marginal economy develops a social psychology appropriate to its work world. As the streetcorner man views his future:

> It is a future in which everything is uncertain except the ultimate destruction of his hopes and the eventual realization of his fears. . . . Thus, when Richard squanders a week's pay in two days it is not because . . . he is . . . unaware of or unconcerned with his future. He does so precisely because he is aware of the future and the hopelessness of it all.[36]

Since the jobs typically available to slum residents have no attraction in terms either of income or of the nature of the work, it is not surprising that many of these jobs are rejected or held for only short periods. A taxing regular job must offer higher income than the economic activities of the irregular economy to appear preferable to them. And it must offer compensation also for the strain of regular hours of work day in and day out, often in physically demanding or boring work, and of accommodating to supervisors.

There is evidence that many from poverty areas do not stay, even on better jobs. They may not know how to behave on such jobs or find it difficult to maintain the routine; or too much may be expected of them too soon; or their off-job situation may make it difficult to keep the job. For such workers, placement in jobs in the mainstream economy may not be enough; they will need assistance in handling and adjusting to the new jobs.

Employers and supervisors need to develop increased understanding of these workers' problems and to learn how they can be handled. When jobs are opened up for the disadvantaged, changes in the customary work patterns and in supervisory relationships are likely to be essential if the workers are to succeed in, and stay on, the job.

Furthermore, manpower and social policy must be concerned with the ways in which work-training and welfare programs influence the irregular economy. The more differentiated and partial the benefit system, the more opportunities for integration of this system with the irregular economy's other income sources. Programs which provide only marginal increases in an individual's income tend to reinforce this economy.

To challenge it effectively, more attractive alternatives must be provided. This can be done by helping private employers open reasonably well-paying jobs in the regular economy to sub-employed workers. Many individuals who live in the irregular economy are eager to leave it, provided they have a chance to really advance their position in a society strongly oriented toward consumption. They would welcome an opportunity to move from a dead end job to a career opportunity, such as the New Careers Program is designed to offer.[37]

The AFDC Mother—A Case Study of Sub-Employment

Mothers receiving assistance through the Federal program of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) provide an illustrative case study of one group of sub-employed in the irregular economy—their problems, their difficulties in meeting these problems, and the way in which they react not only to their individual situations but

[35] Elliot Liebow, *Tally's Corner* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1967). pp. 57–59. This study describes the job and other experiences of the Negro marginal worker in a big city.

[36] Liebow, op. cit., p. 66.

[37] For a discussion of this program, see the chapter on New Developments in Manpower Programs.

also to the economic opportunities available to them.

Many theories have been evolved, and myths created, about this relatively small group of the underprivileged. Recipients of AFDC have been widely regarded as caught in a chronic, static condition of dependency, handed down from one generation to the next. Welfare has been viewed as an alternative to work, increasingly unrelated to such economic factors as the general level of unemployment or the participation of women in the labor force. This discussion looks at some of these theories in the light of available evidence. Obviously, there are families whose members have been brought up with welfare support and then have gone on to raise their own families with such support. But there are also many families whose members are on welfare rolls for very short periods of time and never sever their connection with the labor force, even when they are on welfare.

AFDC recipients are encouraged by welfare agencies to find work. Their earnings are included in the total family income that is considered when the amount of welfare payment is determined. States may, however, disregard some part of the earnings of mothers in order to conserve them for the future needs of children.[38]

Each State sets its own cost standards for living requirements under AFDC. But many States also set arbitrary ceilings on the amount of assistance that will actually be paid—often well below the amount of determined need.

Data for the analysis that follows are drawn largely from the only two available national studies of AFDC caseloads. A study sponsored by the American Public Welfare Association was based on a 1-in-3 sample of cases closed during the first 3 months of 1961;[39] a study sponsored by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) covered a 1-percent sample of the cases currently active during the last 2 months of 1961.[40] The situation has undergone changes since that time—one of the most notable being the continuing increase in the AFDC caseload, despite the marked reduction in the overall rate of unemployment. The increased caseload is the result of many factors, including an increase in the numbers of young children, of female-headed households, and of children in such households; a relaxation in eligibility requirements in many States; and wider knowledge of the existence of the AFDC program. However, more recent evidence, including several studies of local situations, in general bears out the conclusions reached in the two nationwide surveys.

LENGTH OF TIME ON WELFARE

One way of exploring whether welfare is in fact a way of life, passed on from one generation to another, is to examine the length of time individual recipients remain on welfare. In 1961, the median length of time on AFDC was 27 months for currently active cases and 18 months for closed cases. But the length of time on assistance varied widely with both race and residence. For closed cases, the median time spent on assistance was higher for Negroes (22 months) than for whites (15 months) and lower in urban areas (16 months) than in rural areas (20 months). Periods of dependency tended to be longer in medium-sized cities (50,000 to 500,000) than in the largest cities. In general, however, the mothers in rural farm and nonfarm areas were those who spent the longest continuous periods of time on assistance.[41]

These figures on "continuous time" on assistance obscure the great turnover in the AFDC rolls. A recent analysis of case turnover showed that 584,000 cases were authorized and 508,000 cases were closed in calendar year 1966, while slightly more than 1 million were carried over from the preceding year. Averaged over the year, about 45,000 new families were added to the rolls each month, while 41,000 left. Certain families have repeated periods on relief; of the cases added in 1966, about 34 percent had received assistance previously.[42]

---

[38] The 1967 amendments liberalize somewhat the amount of income which may be excluded in determining AFDC assistance. See *Summary of Social Security Amendments of 1967* (Washington: 90th Cong., 1st sess., Committee on Finance of the U.S. Senate and Committee on Ways and Means of the U.S. House of Representatives, December 1967), p. 17.

[39] M. Elaine Burgess and Daniel O. Price, *An American Dependency Challenge* (Chicago: American Public Welfare Association, 1963).

[40] *Study of Recipients of Aid to Families With Dependent Children, November–December 1961; National Cross-Tabulations* (Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Welfare Administration, August 1965).

[41] Burgess and Price, op. cit., p. 50.

[42] Wilbur Cohen, testifying as Under Secretary of HEW, said that it would be a great mistake to think of the caseload as being static, with the same families continuing to receive assistance for long periods of time. *Social Security Amendments of 1967*, Hearings Before the Committee on Finance (Washington: 90th Cong., 1st sess., U.S. Senate, Committee on Finance, 1967), H.R. 12080, pt. I, pp. 254 and 730.

Since individuals do go on and off welfare, cumulative data showing the total time spent on welfare by an AFDC mother and her children are important in determining how welfare fits into their life cycle. According to the study of cases closed in 1961, 10 percent of the Negro and 7 percent of the white mothers had spent 9 or more years on welfare. Nevertheless, in absolute terms, white families outnumbered Negro families among the very small minority of AFDC cases on assistance for as long as this.[43]

The proportion of their adult life that women spend on AFDC is another significant measure of their dependence on this assistance. A study based on a 1-percent random sample of AFDC cases in Philadelphia (drawn in 1959, and followed through to 1962) showed that the majority (60 percent) had spent slightly less than half (47 percent) of their adult life on welfare.[44] In at least one city, then, welfare was not a permanent or exclusive style of life for all of the women on AFDC during the time they raised their children.

Finally, intergenerational dependency on welfare can also be measured. In the cases closed during early 1961, less than a third both of the white and of the Negro mothers had grown up in families in which their parents had also been on assistance.[45] However, a study in the State of Washington in 1964 yielded a substantially higher figure. About 43 percent of the AFDC mothers in the sample reported that their parents had been on assistance—3 percent said their parents had been dependent for as long as they could remember; 27 percent said that they had been dependent for several years; and 13 percent said that they had received assistance for a brief period.[46]

Altogether, the generalization that welfare becomes a permanent style of life for all or most AFDC recipients is not supported by the available evidence. The people on welfare are a varied group. Many of the families are not involved in long-term or intergenerational dependency. It must be recognized, however, that significant proportions of AFDC families do represent a second generation on welfare. This is one of the problems to which the program changes provided for by the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act are addressed.

WELFARE AND WORK

Welfare and employment are widely regarded as alternative rather than complementary or overlapping sources of income. The AFDC caseload is generally seen as made up of nonworking mothers. This is consistent with the theory of public assistance embodied in the original Social Security Act of 1935, which assumed that social insurance protected members of the labor force when their income was interrupted, while federally financed social assistance was for the unemployable. The 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act are directed at promoting economic independence—a permanent or long term break from the irregular economy—through a program of social services, job training, and cash incentives.[47]

[43] Burgess and Price, op. cit., p. 49.

[44] Jane C. Kronick, "Family Life and Economic Dependency, A Report to the Welfare Administration" October 27, 1965 (mimeo.). In addition, a special analysis of the relationship between welfare and work experience of AFDC families in Philadelphia was made for this report.

The age of the mothers is important since a high proportion of adult life can mean a short period of time in the case of young mothers. In the Philadelphia study, the average age of the mothers was 35, and as only a small proportion of young mothers was included, age bias does not appear important in this case.

[45] Burgess and Price, op. cit., based on tables on pp. 258, 259, and 280.

[46] *Public Welfare, Poverty—Prevention or Perpetuation* (New York: Greenleigh Associates, December 1964), p. 32.

[47] The new Work Incentives Program for welfare recipients (WIN) is discussed in more detail in the chapter on New Developments in Manpower Programs.

TABLE 1. PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF AFDC CHILDREN BY COLOR AND BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF HOMEMAKER DURING PERIOD ON AFDC[1]

Employment status of homemaker	White	Negro
Total: Number	9,629	4,245
Percent	100.0	100.0
Employed	26.4	40.6
Full-time throughout period	3.0	5.4
Full-time most of period	4.5	4.4
Part-time throughout period	4.8	11.0
Part-time most of period	7.2	12.6
Other employment history	6.9	7.2
Not employed	73.2	58.8
Employment status unknown	.4	.6

[1] Based on a sample of cases closed in first 3 months of 1961; includes children born in wedlock only.

SOURCE: M. Elaine Burgess and Daniel O. Price, *An American Dependency Challenge* (Chicago: American Public Welfare Association, 1963), based on table on p. 268.

The recent amendments are based on the assumption that AFDC mothers have been entirely outside the labor force and that, if adequate child-care facilities are made available, they can, through training and other services, be enabled to care for themselves and their families. But, in fact, AFDC mothers have frequently been active members of the sub-employed labor force—the underemployed and low-wage workers. Public assistance often served as a form of wage supplementation for the low-paid, partially employed worker. Welfare status did not necessarily represent a sharp break with the labor force, as the theory of assistance would imply.

The study of AFDC cases closed in 1961 showed that about 26 percent of the white and 41 percent of the Negro children were in families where the mothers had maintained some degree of attachment to the labor force during the periods on AFDC. (See table 1.) About half of the mothers had been regularly employed before receiving welfare and continued to be regularly employed after receipt of AFDC payments.[48]

The HEW study of AFDC cases active in late 1961 showed the mother's employment status at a given point in time, rather than over a longer period. Of all AFDC mothers on the rolls at the time of the study, 14 percent were employed—including 11 percent of the white and 19 percent of the Negro mothers.[49]

The study of the AFDC caseload in Philadelphia in 1962 classified the work history of AFDC mothers in terms of their level of skill and job stability, based on information on their first job, their longest job, and their most recent job. About 40 percent of the women had a stable work history, and 47 percent an unstable one. Only 13 percent had no history of work. Of those with a work history, 40 percent had been employed in skilled or semi-skilled jobs.

Thus, AFDC mothers can hardly be described as a group made up predominantly of "work-shy women" who inherited their welfare status. However, there appears to be a generational difference in these women's work histories. The older ones had the more stable work history but lower levels of skill, while the reverse was true for the younger women. These different work habits may have resulted from the nature of the job market

[48] Burgess and Price, op. cit., pp. 28 and 250.

[49] *Study of Recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children, November–December 1961: National Cross-Tabulations,* table 25.

TABLE 2. PLACE OF RESIDENCE AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF HOMEMAKER DURING PERIOD ON AFDC, BY COLOR[1]

Place of residence	All AFDC families[2] (percent distribution)	Percent with homemaker employed	
		White	Negro
Total	100.0	26.4	40.6
METROPOLITAN COUNTIES			
City of 500,000 or more	25.3	16.4	23.5
City of 50,000 to 499,999	21.1	25.9	45.8
City of 2,500 to 49,999	7.5	25.8	44.4
Rura. nonfarm	4.4	25.6	56.5
NONMETROPOLITAN COUNTIES			
City of 2,500 to 49,999	19.4	33.2	57.6
Rural nonfarm	18.4	26.7	56.5
Farm	3.9	20.8	72.9

[1] Based on a sample of cases closed during first 3 months of 1961.

[2] A few families, 0.3 percent, were in farm areas of metropolitan counties.

SOURCE: M. Elaine Burgess and Daniel O. Price, *An American Dependency Challenge* (Chicago: American Public Welfare Association, 1963), based on tables on pp. 264, 265, and 268.

at the time the women entered it. Older women had apparently been able to develop a pattern of stability in a job world which accepted their low level of skill, but younger women with higher education and somewhat more skill appeared unable to develop a pattern of work stability in the present, more demanding job market. In general, the women who were unskilled workers had spent less of their adult lives on assistance than had the more skilled.

In view of the generally higher overall rates of unemployment among unskilled than higher skilled workers, this is a rather significant finding. It underlines the special circumstances—social and psychological as well as economic—which affect the work situation of these sub-employed women and other groups in the irregular economy.

The type of locality in which these mothers lived also had a marked effect on their pattern of employment. According to the study of cases closed in early 1961, the proportion of mothers who had been employed was lowest in large cities. This was true of both white and Negro mothers, but geographic location had a greater effect on the employment pattern of Negro women than on that

of whites. Only about one-fourth of the Negro women in cities of over half a million had worked while on welfare, as compared with nearly 3 out of every 4 of those on farms. (See table 2.)

SOME IMPLICATIONS AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENTS

These findings cast some doubt on two of the dominant ideas which color much of the discussion about the public assistance program—that being on welfare generally becomes a permanent style of life and that the benefits it provides are an alternative to work. Employment and welfare are systems which mesh in complex ways. Welfare is a form of social provision when income is absent, interrupted, or inadequate, and not simply a cash transfer system operating outside the world of work.

Much more information is needed, however, about the interrelationships between work and welfare and, in particular, about why many AFDC mothers work. At present, there is no definitive information on this latter point. One can do little more than speculate regarding the factors that enter into the situation and even about how many mothers do and do not increase their total income through their work.

To throw light on these basic questions will require extensive study of the circumstances surrounding these women's employment, as well as analysis of their budgets. The need for such research is the more urgent because of the possible implications of the findings for current programs aimed at increasing employment of AFDC mothers.

It seems probable that, in many cases, monetary incentives may not be the crucial factor in the mothers' decisions to work. At the same time, it is likely to take more than minimum earnings to effect a real change in the status of AFDC recipients; this requires income adequate for upward mobility—for a takeoff from dependency to economic self-sufficiency.[50] Thus, programs of income incentives and work training may not reverse the upward trend in the welfare rolls, unless the training is designed to move clients to permanent employment at adequate wages. The new Work Incentive Program established under the 1967 Social Security Act amendments is aimed at precisely this objective.

An expansion of child-care facilities is also provided for by these amendments, on the assumption that lack of such facilities has been one of the factors which prevent AFDC mothers from seeking employment. The total capacity of licensed child-care facilities in the United States is placed presently at only 310,000 to 350,000. So the proportion of working women using such facilities is necessarily small. According to a 1965 study, only about 5 percent of all working mothers placed their children in group care. Of those with low incomes (under $3,000), only 3 percent used such facilities.

In view of these findings, it is not clear how expansion of child-care facilities will affect the AFDC mother's entry into the labor force. But whether or not the number of such mothers who become economically self-sufficient increases markedly, the provision of more good facilities for child care should help both the mothers and the children who use them. It may reasonably be expected that such services will ease the tensions of work for these women and reduce their absences from the job. They will also improve the situation of the children, who will benefit socially and educationally from organized programs of care.

Some Considerations Affecting Manpower Policies

OBJECTIVES IN JOB DEVELOPMENT

To provide a satisfactory alternative to dependence on welfare or other sources of income in the irregular economy, a job must now offer more than mere subsistence. This is apparent from the foregoing discussion both of the irregular economy and of AFDC mothers' sometimes alternate, sometimes simultaneous reliance on work and welfare.

Jobs which furnish only subsistence for the worker and his family have become less and less satisfactory, as the majority of people in this coun-

[50] For a discussion of this issue, see Alvin L. Schorr, *Poor Kids* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965).

try have achieved higher standards of living, and as the provision of minimum subsistence has become increasingly a function of public welfare. Little is yet known about the job "extras" which are most important to sub-employed workers, but the identification of these "extras" is crucial to a successful policy of job creation for the disadvantaged.

Two questions must be considered. The first relates to the amount of earnings: How much more than subsistence is a job expected to provide? The second involves the kinds of job extras which may be expected. While these two questions are not easily distinguished, their formulation may help clarify the problems manpower policy must confront.

Does the prospective jobholder see his job as one which should provide him with the means to subsistence, plus comfort and security? Or does he want a "career"—a reasonable expectation that he will be able to move upward, socially and economically?

A study of Negroes in Philadelphia illustrates the importance of income as opposed to status. Given a hypothetical choice between a high-status but relatively low-paid job and a low-status but higher paid job, those in the lowest socioeconomic group consistently chose the latter. But this was not true for respondents with higher status.[51]

Further evidence also suggests that among workers in low-income groups, the majority direct their job aspirations toward the goal of the "good American life"—of ability to provide for the comfort and security of their families. Both men and women respondents in a public housing project in St. Louis generally agreed that "a job should come first," and that "the most important thing a parent can do is to help his children get further ahead than he did." [52]

Thus, current concern about dead end jobs may not be valid for many sub-employed adults, since the first priority for those with family responsibilities is likely to be a job with wages high enough for adequate family support, and indirectly for the upward mobility of the children. For lower income respondents who have modest aspirations and who wish to provide for their families, the level of wages and job security become important considerations in job creation. Members of this group want to be part of the stable working class, and they are not averse to menial jobs, if such jobs pay well.

At some point in the lives of many disadvantaged boys and men, aspirations for a job which would provide either "the good American life" or career success become frustrated. Made aware of these generally accepted objectives through mass communications media, if not through personal experience, these men often have a heightened sense of comparative deprivation as well as frustration.

One response to this frustration is retreat into despair and hopelessness; another is resort to illegitimate activity. The slum resident who frequently has even his modest aspirations frustrated also lives in a community environment which provides relatively easy access to illegitimate means for achieving those aspirations. As the Secretary of Labor has said: [53]

> We realize all of a sudden the very intimate, sinister, complex interrelationship between crime and the unemployment that we have now. It is not only that unemployment produces crime. It is that crime, to a very considerable extent, complicates the motivational problem in the slums. I hate to say to you how many times we run into a boy who hesitates to take a training program with an allowance of perhaps $35 a week, when he could make five times that much peddling dope.

In dealing with the critical though small minority of the sub-employed engaged in activities such as peddling dope and picking up numbers, Government job creation and training programs compete with the high monetary return of organized crime, as well as with other economic rewards of the irregular economy. Such illegitimate job substitutes also have other attractions for slum residents in addition to their monetary aspects, and these must be better understood also if the problems they present are to be met. Nevertheless, the inference is clear from several studies that people in lower income groups generally prefer less remunerative but secure jobs to high-paying, high-risk activities. Crime cannot provide the "extra" of job security; perhaps governmental policy can.

Finally, manpower and antipoverty programs may themselves contribute to frustration if they raise hopes which they fail to fulfill. These programs have done much to awaken dormant aspirations. For example, about two-thirds of Job Corps

[51] Seymour Parker and Robert Kleiner, "Status Position, Mobility, and Ethnic Identification of the Negro," *Journal of Social Issues*, April 1964, pp. 85–102.

[52] William Yancy, op. cit.

[53] *Examination of the War on Poverty*, Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty (Washington; 90th Cong., 1st sess., U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, July 1967), S. 1545, pt. 10, p. 3237.

recruits already had jobs—generally at very low wages—but wanted to better their situation. If programs do not meet justified expectations, despair will intensify.

The dilemma is clear. Without aspirations and hope, little can be accomplished. But aspirations and hope are fragile, requiring reinforcement from life experience. To snuff out hope once it is kindled may leave a worse situation than before.

SOCIAL OBJECTIVES

If manpower policy is to serve social objectives with emphasis on the disadvantaged, these objectives must be better understood and articulated. The priorities assigned to different objectives—implicitly if not explicitly—greatly influence decisions as to how manpower resources should be allocated.

The three objectives selected for discussion here represent alternative approaches to the common goal of social integration and stability. They all bear directly on current efforts to help the sub-employed enter and adjust to regular jobs, and to overcome dependence on welfare or extra-legal activities. These related but also competing objectives are:

—To substitute earned for unearned income, because of the therapeutic quality of work.

—To contribute to family stability by concentrating on employment for men, while also considering the needs of women family heads.

—To build self-respect and satisfaction by providing jobs which have "quality," either in terms of career potential or immediately satisfactory income.

Work as Social Therapy

The rationale for emphasizing work or earned income as a social objective lies in the constructive impact work has on behavior. In past years, theories of how to promote personal and social stability and reduce delinquency and crime placed reliance on remedial programs involving organized recreation, street clubs which combined play and counseling, and sound housing to replace dilapidated slums. But faith in these approaches has been slowly lost. Today, the opportunity theory of delinquency stresses the importance of removing barriers which inhibit low-income youth from sharing the employment and other benefits available in the broader society.

Loosely interpreted, this theory means programs which emphasize jobs and education. The Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 adopted this frame of reference in launching a series of new programs which emphasized the link between work and reduction of social disorganization. In the wake of riots and unrest in the central cities, the theory that work may reduce crime has been extended to include the idea that work may also reduce social unrest.

This theory of the therapeutic effects of work has led to policies aimed at getting as many of the sub-employed as possible into jobs—at substituting earned income for public relief or the hustle. Emphasis is on the importance of jobs as such; the quality of the jobs and the level of income they produce are regarded as secondary considerations.

The analysis earlier in this chapter of the demographic characteristics of the sub-employed and the social-psychological barriers to their employment lends some support to this approach by underlining the importance of entry jobs for these disadvantaged people. But the foregoing discussion also suggests the shortcomings of this thesis, which makes no allowance for the job "extras" many individuals may demand as offsets to the advantages of activities in the irregular economy, and in fulfillment of expectations as to an acceptable level of income in this affluent country.

Personal and Family Stability

Complementary to the theory of the social therapy of work is the objective of increasing family stability. This objective stresses the male-headed household, where the man can serve as the role model for young people as they develop. The quality of family life is assumed to generate motivation for work and social involvement. Accordingly, manpower and social policies must be directed at strengthening the family, which serves as the most effective instrument for social orientation of youth and for facilitating their entry into the job market.

With family stability a primary objective, manpower policy must be aimed not simply at expanding employment of the disadvantaged but also at determining which individuals are to get the avail-

93-459 O - 68 - 9

able jobs. And on this point, the implication is clear: priority should be given to jobs for adult men—in the hope that this will have the double effect of keeping men who are already household heads in their homes and of encouraging those who have left the household to return. Men are not always the most disadvantaged members of the sub-employed. But if they are to achieve the same position in the world of the minority which they enjoy in that of the majority, they must become the principal wage earners and family providers.

At the same time, the many women who are household heads also deserve priority consideration. Families headed by women are among the most impoverished, include large numbers of children, and provide the only source of psychological and economic stability these children have. The disadvantaged women who carry the heavy burden of supporting a family have a high claim on training opportunities and other help in obtaining decently paid jobs.

The Quality of Work and Income

The third objective is "decent" work and adequate income. This approach emphasizes the link between the level of income and social stability. The quality of work and the amount of income are regarded as of prime importance (rather than the source of income, emphasized in the approach based on the therapeutic value of work). Work in itself may not be as critical as the amount of income it yields.

A project in Milwaukee designed to retrain AFDC mothers for employment illustrates this point. According to the data available, the mothers were enabled to get and presumably hold jobs, but their earnings were not appreciably higher than their welfare payments had been. The source of their income was changed without improving the quality of their life.

Such an outcome might be acceptable if it is assumed that welfare payments are stigmatizing. On this basis, substituting earned income for welfare would, by itself, enhance the individuals' dignity and improve the quality of their life. But it could be argued that the stigma might also be removed by developing alternative cash transfer programs—family allowances or a negative income tax, for example—which allocate income with dignity.

That the quality of work and the level of income earned may be crucial in promoting social stability is suggested by more direct evidence, however. The participants in recent urban riots apparently did not represent the most disadvantaged people in the slum areas involved. Indeed, "evidence about educational achievement suggests that the rioters were . . . slightly better educated than their peers . . . and . . . the great majority . . . were currently employed." The conclusion was that the Watts rioters were in "the mainstream of modern Negro urban life." [54] They were not simply seeking jobs, but better ones. This may indicate that, to a large group of rioters, jobs with dignity and power were more important than just being at work.

A Department of Labor study of 500 persons arrested in connection with the Detroit riots in July 1967 led to similar findings.[55] The typical prisoner was employed at the time of the riot—working in a manufacturing plant, where he earned an average of $120 a week. Two out of every five of the prisoners had a high school education or better, but only a few (probably around 1 out of 10) had a skilled or white-collar job, commensurate with this level of education. Furthermore, the rate of unemployment was high—22 percent, about five times the average unemployment rate for the entire Detroit metropolitan area.

The kinds of tasks involved in a job and the conditions under which these are performed can be important also. A low-status job presumably affects the worker's attitudes about himself as well as his employment. In a society where the poor of a big city can constantly see the inequities of their situation, the issue is not merely jobs as against no jobs, but what kind of jobs they can get.[56] The quality of the jobs available to slum residents assumes steadily growing importance—measured in terms not only of income and stability but also of amenities such as decent treatment by supervisors and of the absence of strenuous labor. Freedom from hard physical work has become an important status symbol in the present-day non-agricultural economy, and the physical limitations of many of the sub-employed make heavy labor impossible for them.

From this perspective, it is not enough to get

[54] Robert M. Fogelson, "White on Black: A Critique of the McCone Commission Report on the Los Angeles Riots," *Political Science Quarterly*, September 1967, p. 346.

[55] See *The Detroit Riot . . . A Profile of 500 Prisoners* (Washington: U.S. Department of Labor), March 1968.

[56] Herbert Gans, "Malemployment," *New Generation*, Spring 1968.

poor people—or even adult men—into jobs. Rather, it is essential to provide decent, acceptable work for the sub-employed. This theory assumes that significant changes in behavior might not result, for example, if unemployment were wiped out by obvious, permanent make-work. Full participation in economic life requires a job meeting decent standards with respect to treatment by supervisors, the nature of the work involved, adequacy of income, and employment security.

One of the important sources of jobs of quality, dignity, and power is employment in ghetto establishments, owned and operated by members of the ghetto community. Bringing into the area plants and jobs controlled by outside businesses may not be sufficient, although if local residents participate in the management of these plants, this difficulty may be overcome.

The analogy with developing countries is compelling. Citizens of such countries insist not only on jobs at high pay but also on control over, and ownership of, the industry as well. A job becomes a way of getting power and prestige, as well as income.

The development of community corporations or small businesses in the ghetto will buttress the elements of strength in the ghetto community. While such firms may not by themselves have a major impact on the sub-employment problem, the effect on morale is likely to be marked.

Needs and Strategies in Manpower Policies

The varied needs of the different groups of sub-employed and the divergent social objectives just discussed call for a variety of program strategies. This has been recognized in developing the present battery of manpower programs, many of which are aimed specifically at problems outlined in this chapter. A vital step is continuing improvement in program operations as new information is obtained on the effectiveness of each program in reaching the social objectives just discussed. Similarly, continuous study will be required of the interrelationships between programs and the extent to which they compete with or reinforce each other. And even while feedback on program accomplishments is being obtained, priorities will need to be established among the social objectives specified and, correlatively, among the various possible approaches to aiding the disadvantaged.

The need for frequent evaluation and adjustment of manpower programs in the light of social objectives has been recognized since the early days of these programs. It now appears, for example, that a major focus of manpower policy should be on efforts to reduce sub-employment of adult men in large cities—balancing the recent emphasis on youth programs and the relatively large opportunities for training provided for women in some localities under the Manpower Development and Training Act. Furthermore, the success of the efforts now being made to meet employment needs and diminish social unrest in the ghettos through the new Job Opportunities in Business Sector (JOBS) Program and the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) may well hinge upon the success of these programs in providing not merely additional jobs, but quality jobs, for the sub-employed.[57]

To undergird efforts in all these areas of manpower concern, further progress is needed also in four broad directions—toward further integration of manpower program and services; toward the development of a variety of job situations suited to the needs of the sub-employed; toward resources adequate for the complex of individualized services they need; and toward improvements in the quality of programs. Manpower strategy is and must be concerned with advances in each of these directions.

TOWARD FURTHER INTEGRATION OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Federal, State, and local governments all contribute in many ways to the country's manpower programs. A large number of agencies at every level of government are involved in providing training, job development, placement, and other

[57] For a discussion of these and other current manpower programs and the objectives to which they are directed, see the chapter on New Developments in Manpower Programs.

manpower services. They have also participated in the shift in manpower goals, during the last few years, to primary orientation toward the disadvantaged worker.

With this shift has come increased experimentation and exploration, but not yet a fully coordinated and interconnected system of programs and services. Problems of coordination of manpower programs at the Federal level have been substantially worked out. However, the development of the best possible working relationships between Federal, State, and local agencies is still unfinished business, although substantial progress has been made in this direction.

The characteristics of a fully developed manpower system are known—integrated, flexible, diversified, person-centered, coordinated, durable, and continuous. The difficulties lie in implementing these concepts, not only at the Federal, State, and city levels, but even more critically at the neighborhood level. Development of responsibility and authority in the neighborhood is crucial, but to achieve this also requires allocation of responsibility and authority at higher levels in the city and above.

The structure of programs—involving many different public and private agencies, with separate funding and separate staffs—has been a major obstacle in efforts to forge an effective system. It has also had a direct effect on the quality of services provided. Just as the allocation of welfare expenditures often forces an individual to receive services based on the category into which he fits, rather than on his particular needs, so the divisions between manpower programs have hampered the provision of services tailored to the individual.[58]

Integration and coordination of activities, needed at all levels, are most important at the point of delivery of services. To be effective, efforts to increase coordination must be aimed directly at better service to the individuals involved.

Sub-employed individuals who are to be helped should each be assigned to a person who can call on services, obtain jobs, and the like. This person would make the important recommendations and arrange for the services. He should follow through on the entire process, so that there is clear-cut responsibility for the outcome.

Another important issue is the appropriate sorting of individuals into the various manpower programs. The program an individual goes into has depended to some extent on chance, partly because many cities have lacked a central agency in close contact with the variety of programs now available. It is now recognized as essential to assure that a person is routed into the appropriate activity, that he benefits from the program, and that he is enabled to move into a decent job.

In the past, the unit of manpower policy has been, to a large extent, the individual program rather than the individual person. But as many recent program developments emphasize, the need is for centering on the person and for assuring that he gets a job. Responsibility should not end there, however, since he may not stay on the job, especially if he is among the more disadvantaged workers. Responsibility for the worker must extend beyond the initial placement and even involve giving a second chance to those who quit.

To provide the organizational framework that would facilitate the exercise of effective and continuing concern for individuals is the objective of a number of major new programs—notably, the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System and the Concentrated Employment Program. The new neighborhood centers in many areas also are aimed at bringing to individuals the constellation of services they need.

Steady improvements may be expected through these efforts to coordinate and concentrate programs. It should be recognized, however, that grave difficulties are often encountered and have to be overcome in bringing the needed program components together into an effective system.[59]

TOWARD OPENING MORE JOBS FOR THE SUB-EMPLOYED

The economic expansion of the past 7 years has drawn many previously jobless workers into employment in cities and rural areas as well. But many of the sub-employed in city slums have not obtained jobs and will not get them without special help, even assuming continued rapid economic growth.

All too often, decent employment has not been available for relatively low-skilled workers under

[58] Martin Rein, "The Social Service Crisis," *Transaction*, May 1964, pp. 3–6, and 31–32.

[59] For a detailed account of recent experience, see Peter Marris and Martin Rein, *Dilemmas of Social Reform*, Poverty and Community Action in the United States (New York: Atherton Press, 1966), pp. 70–92.

prevailing hiring standards. Employers are frequently unwilling to tolerate workers who do not quickly meet established standards of promptness, low absenteeism, and comportment. The key, then, is the development of more job situations suited to the needs of the disadvantaged, and designed to aid both the worker and the employer in what may be a difficult adjustment process.

Some of the sub-employed can work in standard jobs if hiring—and also retention—requirements are reduced. There has been, in fact, considerable movement in this direction in both the public and private sectors of the economy. Many government agencies have scaled down their educational requirements. In several cities, employers have begun to hire men whom they would previously have rejected. More than hiring appears to be necessary, however, in view of reports of frequently high turnover rates among disadvantaged workers in these standard jobs.

At least some standard jobs could be modified to provide more extensive and flexible induction processes on the job. Workers new to production-line activity or to steady, quality employment do not always rapidly accept and acquire the normal work practices and habits. While some of the disadvantaged have no problem in adjusting to a steady work pattern, experience shows that many do. To meet their special needs, the standard job might be modified in one of two ways—adaptation of traditional working arrangements, or increased and continued services and supervision. The former approach may involve longer work induction and training processes than are typically required for new recruits. In some cases, it may be desirable to assign disadvantaged workers, at least at the beginning, to units made up of formerly sub-employed workers who have adjusted to the work pattern.[60] It may be useful, also, to experiment with placing these workers throughout a plant as openings arise, or with mixed units including both disadvantaged and other workers. No one method is appropriate for all of the sub-employed, and a large plant employing many of the disadvantaged might utilize different methods—in each case selecting that which best fits the particular worker.

Separate work units for the formerly sub-employed—whether in plants to which they travel or in new firms near their homes—would facilitate adjusting their work day, if this appears necessary to keep these workers on the job. Is it essential that everyone work a regular 8-hour day? A shorter working day (with less pay) might be possible, at least at the beginning, for workers who are the most difficult to retain. They would then gradually work toward a longer day. Another possibility is to have workers come in later in the morning—perhaps at 9 or 10 a.m.—rather than insisting that everyone get to work by 8 a.m. from the start. Such experiments would, obviously, require a high degree of cooperation and understanding on the part of the regular work force, and might prove feasible only in exceptional work situations.

Still another possibility might be an intensive program of education for workers already on the job, to enlist their help in the adjustment process of the newly hired sub-employed. A key element in the Concentrated Employment Program is the assignment of a "coach" to each new worker to help him adjust to the job, aid him with off-the-job problems, and also help management adjust to these new workers. To be effective, coaches should work with only one or a few of the newly hired, so the system is expensive. It is not a magical solution to the problems of job adjustment and turnover, but in a positive job setting, it can make a substantial contribution.

In addition, supervisors of the formerly sub-employed may need training in working with this group, administrative support for their efforts, and time to spend on working with the new employees. Fitting a new kind of worker into a traditional work assignment may not be easy if the supervisor has this responsibility added to already heavy burdens. If supervisory aides could be provided, this would help to give new workers the kind and extent of supervision many of them need.

These kinds of changes in normal working arrangements would, of course, involve additional costs—and possibly heavy ones. Reimbursement of employers for these extra costs is, therefore, an essential feature of the new JOBS Program and also of several experimental programs already underway.

Besides special working arrangements in standard jobs, "protected" or "sheltered" employment will need to be developed for some of the sub-employed. An unknown but surely substantial number, have difficulty in adapting to even modified employment. "Motivational training" helps some

[60] This arrangement would promote the development of group feeling and team spirit, which might facilitate adjustment to mainstream industrial life.

of them; for Negroes, training programs tied to racial pride may be effective. But for others, training is not the answer; they need to be put directly into remunerative work producing a creditable output. The employment arrangements must be flexible, and the workers must recognize that these arrangements offer the possibility of successful movement into regular jobs.

This kind of graduated, special employment situation may have to continue for a considerable length of time before the worker may be able to manage a job elsewhere. The main purpose should be to provide meaningful, paid work experience for men, though some women will undoubtedly want and need this protected job situation also. There is, of course, danger that such an arrangement will become a permanent crutch for the workers involved. To prevent this will require good supervisors with time to give close attention to individual workers and a definite plan to help ease workers into a more independent role. Counseling and other services should also be available on and off the job.

The development of new types of standard jobs can help to meet the needs of another, less disadvantaged group of the sub-employed. There is need, for example, for rapid expansion of subprofessional occupations and particularly for increasing the number of men in this kind of work. Subprofessional positions have more interesting elements than most of the jobs open to the unskilled. They also have stature. And many subprofessional posts are in poverty areas—an important consideration, since one of the major issues in expanding the number of standard jobs available to the sub-employed is location. As suggested earlier, there is considerable merit in developing standard jobs in the slum neighborhoods where the sub-employed live; travel time is reduced, and attitudes toward work among neighborhood residents may be improved.

The total number of subprofessional jobs so far available to the poor is not large enough, however, to reduce hard-core unemployment significantly. Further expansion of such openings is needed and, along with this, training of and services for the sub-employed to enable them to qualify for these openings.

In many situations, both in government and private agencies, new funds would not be needed to augment the number of subprofessional jobs. Restructuring existing professional jobs (many of which cannot be filled because of shortages of qualified personnel) so that less trained people can take over part of the work would immediately increase the number of openings. While there has been some movement in this direction, so far only a small start has been made toward a potentially more rational allocation of tasks and personnel.

What is needed, then, is a multiple strategy—opening up more traditional jobs to persons with limited education and also developing new kinds of jobs for them. Some of the sub-employed will be able to fill these jobs adequately from the start. For others, the jobs will have to be modified so that they can manage them more effectively; for this group, the provision of supporting services is important. For still others—the ones most difficult to keep on the job—even these steps may not be enough. A new and specially constructed employment situation may be needed for such individuals, without expectation of rapid solution of their work difficulties.

If a wide variety of job situations were available, the sub-employed could go into the one best suited to their needs at a particular stage in their development, and move on to other situations as these become appropriate for them. A variety of opportunities and individual treatment for each sub-employed person are crucially important.

TOWARD ADEQUATE RESOURCES

Manpower programs, to be effective in helping the most disadvantaged, will require large expenditures over an extended period. In the past, instability in funding and lack of assurance of funds from one year to another have sometimes been grave problems. But even more important, of course, is the amount of funds available. The President's recommended budget for fiscal 1969, which calls for an increase of 25 percent in manpower funds, clearly recognizes this fact.

To help a low-skilled worker get and keep a decent job is likely to involve costs beyond those which employers have customarily assumed. Thus, private employers may need financial help if they are to train low-skilled workers and prepare them for responsible, well-paying jobs (as already indicated), and this help may have to continue until the worker has reached reasonably high productivity.

Four factors which contribute to the high cost of helping the disadvantaged are the essentiality

of adequate pay, the length of time during which services should be provided, the wide range of services likely to be required, and the need to open new sources of job opportunities in slum areas.

The target of providing men with satisfying jobs, and with earnings high enough to compete with the irregular economy and to support their families, requires that pay be substantially above the training stipends established in the past. Since these jobs are to be regarded as work rather than training, pay must be indicative of a regular job and not suggestive of a temporary, low training allowance.

If the goal is to insure not merely that the worker gets training or work experience but that he enters and stays in a decent job, it will be necessary to continue services to workers over a much longer period than has been usual in the past. Lengthening the period of responsibility, of course, means higher costs.

In addition, for many of the sub-employed in big cities who are particularly difficult to place, a variety of services will undoubtedly be needed—ranging from medical care to improved basic education, to employment and skill training, to provision of coaches who can facilitate work adjustment. More services for more workers over longer periods mean greater expenditures. But the expression "penny wise, pound foolish" applies particularly in the case of the most disadvantaged worker. If the choice is between giving some limited help to a greater number of the most disadvantaged (at a lower cost per person) or giving a smaller number more intensive services (at higher per-person cost), the latter may be the more desirable course. A little money spent on a greatly disadvantaged individual may serve only as a stopgap and, in the long run, be largely wasted.

A fourth cost factor is that some of the new job opportunities must be located in slum areas. The start-up funds needed for new firms run by neighborhood people will be considerable, as will the operating costs until the new firms become self-supporting.

Altogether, though sizable resources have already been invested by the Government in manpower and job development efforts, the needs of the more disadvantaged workers have not yet been fully met. The President's budget recommendations for fiscal 1969 will make possible expanded programs to get the hard-core unemployed into jobs. Experience during the year will indicate whether still greater resources in providing employment opportunities for the sub-employed of big cities are essential.

TOWARD PROGRESSIVE IMPROVEMENT IN MANPOWER SERVICES

Finally, the efforts already underway to improve the quality of training and other manpower services and their relevance to the needs of the disadvantaged must be continued and strengthened. In training the sub-employed, manpower programs have, to some extent, taken on a function of education and skill development in which the schools have failed, and they have often had as trainees individuals with attitudes shaped by unhappy school experiences. Frequently, the trained personnel and the skill-educational designs needed to work effectively with the sub-employed have been lacking. Coupled with financing and organizational problems, these difficulties have sometimes resulted in low-quality programs, despite constant concern for preventing and remedying such deficiencies.

Clarification of the objectives of individual programs and their components is needed in some cases and is now the target of concerted efforts. Sometimes a program has moved in several directions at the same time. It may, for example, be predicated on the notion of working with the hard-core unemployed, but have an intricate recruiting and intake process. Or training may be oriented to increasing skills, yet a trainee may not be actively discouraged from dropping out of the program to take an available job no better than his previous one.

In seeking to eliminate such inconsistencies, it is recognized that different programs should have different objectives, within an overall manpower plan or system for the community (like that which the CAMPS Program is designed to develop). But whatever its goal, a program must be internally consistent, and its various parts must reinforce each other. A quality program requires moving toward a clear objective in terms of who goes into the program and what the outcome for him is expected to be.

Difficulty in *recruiting qualified staff* and a high rate of staff turnover are major problems for many programs. Those funded on an annual basis find

it hard to attract and keep good staff, although officials frequently have been ingenious in stabilizing funds for more than a year. As one evaluative report on several youth programs concludes: "It takes a new program several months to recruit staff; with the uncertainty of the program beyond the year, many of the staff begin to think of their next job shortly after they begin to work." New financing and staffing patterns are needed in many programs to facilitate recruiting, developing, and keeping a good staff.

Increased emphasis on *staff development*—including both organized training and upgrading arrangements—is another need in many manpower programs. The development of all kinds and levels of staff—counselors, crew chiefs, coaches, administrators—is needed, as the emphasis on improving the situation of the sub-employed adds complexity to the problems with which these staff members must deal.

In the next several years *the role of private business* in manpower development will increase. Large companies have recently begun to recruit disadvantaged workers for the first time in many years. It should not be assumed, however, that these companies' experiences with higher skilled workers automatically give them competence to work effectively with the sub-employed. Indeed, a sense of uncertainty about how to deal with those difficult to place and keep on the job may underlie the refusal by many personnel officers to employ the undereducated and unskilled. The development of staff capable of working effectively with these new employees may be of special importance to the success of the JOBS Program and other efforts to expand opportunities for the disadvantaged in private employment.

Realization of the need for *special approaches in working with the sub-employed* is also growing. Many individuals require programs that offer quick movement to a job, rather than a long process of intake, referral, rehabilitation, and training. Frequently, services must be built around the job, rather than preliminary to it; this may be especially true of remedial education. In general, a visible, concrete, immediate payoff is needed to help the disadvantaged make the initial step into the program. This is no less essential than incentives to stay with the program in the hope of larger returns in the future—the issue now stressed in many programs.

An articulated, quality manpower system should make low-level entry jobs transitional for as many of the sub-employed as possible. In particular, the low-level job should be only a beginning for young workers, which they leave after a short time. Manpower programs should emphasize *development*—not just getting an individual into a low-wage job but continuing the investment in him until he can move up to a more rewarding position.

LIMITATIONS ON MANPOWER OBJECTIVES

The possibilities of a strong manpower policy should not obscure its limits. High employment will not, by itself, resolve all ghetto unrest, though it undoubtedly can make a strong contribution. Much anger arises from the feelings of ghetto people that they are politically powerless, exploited as consumers, denied decent housing and opportunities to move to better neighborhoods, and underprotected and overthreatened by police. Reduced unemployment and higher incomes would eliminate many but not all of these feelings. Manpower policy cannot be expected to handle all the tensions of life.

Nor should it be anticipated that all the sub-employed will get decent jobs. Nor should all the adult poor be employed. The relationship between work and welfare, for example, is more complicated than many realize. Many AFDC mothers already work; getting more of them into jobs may not always be either easy or desirable.

In other words, manpower policy must go hand in hand with economic, educational, welfare, and housing policies in efforts to solve the social and economic problems of the big cities and of the sub-employed.